



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,564	05/07/2007	Dirk Salmon	H0075.70115US00	8565
23628	7590	06/21/2010	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			COOLMAN, VAUGHN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3618			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/21/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,564	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SALMON, DIRK
	<b>Examiner</b> VAUGHN T. COOLMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2010.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-68)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the accumulator" in lines 8-9 (not including the struck-through lines). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the marginal region" in line 9 (not including the struck-through lines). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the accumulator arrangement" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "a transmission" in line 3. It is unclear to the Examiner whether this transmission is the same transmission as claimed in the parent claim, claim 1.

All remaining claims are rejected as depending from a rejected base claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,746,282) in view of Kozlowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,796 B1), Losego (U.S. Patent No. 5,064,012), and Van Horn (U.S. Patent No. 5,773,954).**

[claim 1] Fujiwara discloses a cart (10) including:

a base (1);

at least three wheels (2, 3) mounted to the base;

a structure (FIG 48), arranged over the base, capable of receiving cleaning utensils;

a handle (4); and

at least one electric motor (6a, 6b) functionally linked to a transmission ("associated gear train" not shown) and acting upon at least one of the wheels, the motor being arranged on the underside of the base.

Fujiwara discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention as described above except for explicitly disclosing an accumulator. Kozlowski teaches an accumulator (battery 54) mounted on the underside of the base of a cart. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus shown by Fujiwara with the accumulator of Kozlowski as a power source for the electric motors of Fujiwara (needed for operation).

Fujiwara fails to disclose a docking rail arranged in the marginal region of the base and connectable to a charging rail for charging the accumulator. Losego teaches a cart including an electric motor (52) acting upon at least one of the wheels (18) of the cart (10) and including an accumulator (62) equipped with a docking rail (72) arranged in the marginal region of the base (12) and being constructed for charging the accumulator (column 2, lines 66-68). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cart of Fujiwara with the docking rail of Losego in order to provide a convenient and automatic means to charge the battery.

Fujiwara also fails to disclose a charging rail for charging the accumulator. Van Horn teaches a cart including a docking rail (2050) and a charging rail (2110) for charging an accumulator (2070) on the cart. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cart of Fujiwara with the charging rail of Van Horn in order to provide a convenient and automatic means to charge the battery as well as secure the cart in one location.

**[claim 3]** Kozlowski further teaches a control arrangement connected to the at least one electric motor and the accumulator [arrangement] is provided therein, which includes an operating device (56) proximate to the handle (48).

**[claim 4]** Fujiwara further shows at least three wheels comprises four wheels arranged under the base, with two wheels being fixed and two wheels being steerable.

**[claim 5]** Fujiwara further shows the fixed wheels are arranged approximately at a center of the cart in the region of side edges of the base and one movable wheel is arranged centrally in each of a front edge region and a rear edge region of the base when seen in the driving direction.

**[claim 6]** Fujiwara further shows the at least one electric motor comprises two electric motors, each functionally linked with a fixed wheel via a transmission, and each arranged approximately at the center of the base.

[claim 7] Fujiwara further discloses at least one electric motor, being arranged approximately at a center of the base, and wherein the motor is functionally linked to the fixed wheels via a transmission having a differential.

**Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski, Losego, and Van Horn, and further in view of Andes (U.S. Patent No. 6,443,252 B1).**

[claim 8] Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski, Losego, and Van Horn discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention as described above except for a joystick proximate the hand grip (4). Andes teaches an electric cart (10) including a hand grip (24) and a joystick (34) proximate the hand grip. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus shown by Fujiwara with the joystick and hand grip configuration as taught by Andes in order to provide the advantage of separate controls for manual and powered movement of the cart.

**Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski, Losego, and Van Horn, and further in view of Salmon (DE 100 10 852 A1).**

[claim 10] Fujiwara in view of Kozlowski, Losego, and Van Horn discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention as described above except for a stand for an operator. Salmon teaches a cart including a stand for an operator. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus shown by Fujiwara

with the operator stand of Salmon in order to provide the advantage of decreased operator fatigue.

[claim 11] Examiner notes that the integration of the stand into the base would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Integrating the platform would result in a stronger and more durable base for the cart.

[claim 12] Salmon further teaches the stand including a standing platform having wheels (14) and being attachable to a base of the cart.

*Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gupta et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,871) teaches a docking rail for charging an accumulator on a cart.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAUGHN T. COOLMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 10am-8pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (571) 272-7742. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. Joseph Morano/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3617

VAUGHN T COOLMAN  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3618

/V. T. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3618